

Academic Senate - Minutes
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo

Academic Senate - Minutes
January 12, 1971

I. Session called to order in the Staff Dining Room by Chairman Will Alexander at 3:15 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

W. Alexander	M. Gold	M. O'Leary	J. Rogalla	M. Wilks
A. Andreoli	S. Harden	B. Olsen	A. Rosen	M. Wills
W. Boyce	D. Head	R. Pautz	H. Smith	
C. Beymer (For M. Brady)	H. Honegger	J. Peterson	M. Smith	
R. Burton	A. James	C. Quinlan	N. Smith	
R. Carruthers	R. Johnson	R. Ratcliffe	J. Stuart	
R. Cleath	T. Johnston	H. Rhoads	D. Stubbs	
F. Clogston	J. Lowry	W. Rice	L. Voss	
D. Federer	D. Morgan	H. Rickard	J. Weatherby	
R. Frost	D. Nickell	R. Ritschard	M. Whitson	

Guests:

T. Barnes M. Reidlsperger S. Maughan H. Voeltz S. Datta F. Coyes

Ex-Officio (Voting):

G. Clucas J. Ericson C. Fisher A. Higdon

III. Chairman Alexander called for approval of the minutes of the December 1, 1970 session. MSC (H. Rhoads, R. Ratcliffe) by voiced vote.

Chairman Alexander ordered the minutes of the present session to indicate that the Senate Vice Chairman, John Stuart, acted as Secretary for the meeting.

IV. Business Items

A. Resolution to rescind Senate action - Bart Olsen

Following B. Olsen's motion (seconded by R. Ratcliffe), an hour-long debate ensued. Olsen moved that

- (1) The Academic Senate rescind its earlier endorsement of Engineering 402
- (2) The Academic Senate support the School of Engineering in its attempt to satisfy the recommendations of the ECPD regarding an additional three units of study in the area of liberal arts--that an experimental course, "Human Values in Engineering" Humanities 402X, be formulated by the School of Business and Social Sciences and the School of Communicative Arts and Humanities--The course proposal to follow the normal procedures for implementing new courses, keeping in mind that such a course needs to be available by the Fall Quarter of 1971.

The motion was voted upon by written ballot. Results: 30 for, 12 against, 4 abstentions.

V. Information Items

Chairman Alexander referred Items A and B of the Agenda to Senate members present.

C. Curriculum Committee Report - D. Head

Committee Chairman Head submitted the following interim report from the committee in regard to General Education Requirements:

The Curriculum Committee discussed the general education requirements to be included in the 1973-74 College Catalog and is in agreement that unless there are some new proposals for general education changes, these requirements would remain the same for that catalog. New proposals would include any that have not been presented to the Committee within the past two years.

VI. Discussion Items

A. Personnel Policies Committee - H. Rhoads

Committee Chairman Rhoads distributed draft copies of the preliminary report of the Personnel Policies Committee regarding consultative procedures in appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion of regular faculty members. Rhoads announced that public meetings of the Committee will be held January 25, 26, 1971. Further details of the meetings will be published in the Cal Poly Report.

VII. Announcements

Chairman Alexander reviewed the announcements (A - D) listed in the Agenda and added to Item D. that Statewide Senate Chairman Levern Graves had been invited to attend the February meeting of the Cal Poly Academic Senate.

E. Chairman Alexander informed the Senate of the meeting of the Constitution Study Committee to be held January 19, 1971 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the Staff Dining Room. Outstanding Teacher Selection procedures will be discussed at the public meeting.

VIII. MSC for adjournment at 4:35 p.m.

DRAFT

Personnel Policies Committee

Academic Senate

1/6/71

CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES IN APPOINTMENT,
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

Note: On 5/19/70 the Academic Senate provisionally approved Section I, below, pending completion of materials. Recommended changes since that date are underlined or crossed out.

I. Principles applicable to all consultation in personnel actions:

- A. Full and meaningful faculty participation shall be involved as defined in each procedure.
- B. Consultation shall be carried out with, and recommendations shall be made by, the lowest organizational unit practicable. Except where a clear disciplinary or other functional grouping occurs within a school or department, the lowest organizational unit would be the department. The department (or a school which does not have departments) shall decide whether to limit consultation to the discipline or functional grouping.
- C. When departments or other organizational units, whether because of newness, size, leaves of absence or other similar reasons, are inadequate to make personnel recommendations they may be assisted by other appropriate faculty. The decision to augment such a unit should be made only after consultation with the unit and other appropriate faculty bodies.
- D. Recommendations and decisions shall be based only on professional competence, professional performance, and the educational needs of the specific department as well as of the College.
- E. Administrative recommendations and decisions normally should be in conformity with the recommendations of the appropriate faculty unit or committee. When, however, administrative recommendations and decisions are contrary to the recommendations of the faculty unit, or when they result from a choice between conflicting committee recommendations, explanation of the reasons should be conveyed in writing to the committees or units consulted. All persons making personnel evaluations and recommendations should be made aware that their evaluations and recommendations are subject to review by the person evaluated, administrators with personnel evaluation responsibilities, the Personnel Review Committee of the local Academic Senate, and a Grievance Committee if the recommended action is appealed.

- F. Each department or other organizational unit shall develop, consistent with general college policy, its own written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. Both tenured and non-tenured members shall be involved in the development of this statement. Each departmental statement of criteria shall be approved by the President prior to implementation.
- G. A periodic review of the procedures and criteria shall be carried out by the department or unit at intervals to be determined by the department but at least every three years. This review process shall include involvement of both tenured and non-tenured members.
- H. Each department member shall be given a copy of the written statement of procedures and criteria, as soon as practicable prior to his appointment.

II. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES (Applicable to both full-time and part-time faculty appointments.)

A. General Provisions

1. In the appointment of new faculty, every effort should be made to seek complete information and to evaluate thoroughly the backgrounds of individuals through such means as reference letters, telephone checks, personal interviews, etc. Whenever possible, it is desirable for the candidate to visit the campus and be interviewed by faculty members in his teaching service area, before an offer is made.
2. Every candidate for a faculty position, before being offered an appointment, shall be fully informed of opportunities and limitations with respect to retention, tenure, promotion and working conditions.
3. When a faculty member is appointed with certain specific stipulations which do not circumvent established rules and regulations and which will prevail in later decisions on reappointment and/or tenure, these stipulations shall be made to him in writing prior to his formal acceptance of the appointment.
4. Individuals to be appointed shall be acceptable to the majority of the tenured faculty of the department concerned except under conditions outlined in Section I-C and I-E, above.
5. As early as possible in the course of communications and discussions regarding a position, a prospective appointee shall be clearly informed as to: (a) whether or not the communication constitutes an actual offer of a position and (b) which person or persons have the authority to extend an actual offer of appointment.

B. Special Provisions

It is recognized that because of the differences in the nature, size or constitution of departments, a particular detailed procedure in the appointment process may not be appropriate for a given department. However, the departmental procedures should give consideration to the following questions:

1. Should a separate Appointment Committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations?
 - (a) If so:
 - (1) Shall this committee consist of tenured faculty only?
 - (2) Shall there be non-tenured faculty on this committee? If yes, of what rank?

- (3) Shall there be a student on this committee?
 - (4) Shall there be one or more faculty members from each discipline on this committee?
 - (5) Should the Department Head serve on this committee?
 - (b) If not, what faculty members should be consulted?
2. The functions of the Appointment Committee or consulted group should be made explicit, such as:
- (a) Should the consulted group recommend which disciplines, areas and/or options need academic personnel?
 - (b) Should the consulted group screen all initial letters and applications and recommend which shall be followed up?
 - (c) Should the consulted group try to estimate the prospective appointee's teaching ability through a formal presentation?
 - (d) How should the recommendations of the consulted group be handled?

III. REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

A. General Procedures

1. Each probationary faculty member, full time or part time, shall be evaluated at least annually, in accordance with the established timetable, by appropriate faculty and administrative personnel guided by the consultative principles expressed in Section I, above. In the evaluative and consultative processes at the Department level, appropriate faculty should include tenured faculty members in the same discipline or department and appropriate administrative personnel should include the Department Head or his equivalent.
2. Following each evaluation, the person evaluated shall be promptly informed by his department head of his apparent strengths, weaknesses, and prospects for future career in the department or School as indicated by the evaluation.
3. No faculty member shall be reappointed who is not acceptable to a majority of the tenured faculty of the Department or organizational unit concerned except under the conditions expressed in Section I-C and I-E above.
4. All committees and administrators, other than the President, who review and make recommendations on reappointment or termination of a full time faculty member shall be required to forward reasons (in writing) for their recommendation. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
5. If a termination recommendation is made by the Department Head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If a termination recommendation is made by the Dean or Division Head he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the Department Head. These discussions of reasons for termination shall take place prior to review by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
6. Notification of non-reappointment shall be in writing in conformity with dates and procedures established in Title V, California Administrative Code. Although the President or his designee may not routinely give written reasons for termination of non-tenured faculty, the faculty member may request, and shall receive from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his termination.

B. Special Provisions

It is recognized that, because of differences in the nature, size, or constitution of departments, a particular detailed procedure in the reappointment process may not be appropriate for a given department. However, the departmental procedures should give consideration to the following questions:

1. Should a separate Reappointment Committee be charged with responsibility?
 - a. If so:
 - (1) What functions should the Committee have?
 - (a) Evaluation of professional and teaching performance, research and creative activities, contributions to the institution and community, appropriate academic training or experience to perform the required duties? (Evidence for evaluation could include class visitation, review of course outlines, tests, publications, and documents submitted by the person being evaluated. Peer opinion, alumni opinion, student opinion, and statements by the person being evaluated regarding his performance in any significant area could also be considered.)
 - (b) Recommendation of reappointment or termination to appropriate administrators and committees?
 - (2) How shall the Committee be constituted?
 - (a) Shall only tenured faculty of the same department and discipline be included?
 - (b) Shall non-tenured members be included? If so, what rank?
 - (c) Shall faculty members in the same department, but in another discipline, be included?
 - (d) Shall there be a student on the Committee?
 - (e) Shall the Department Head serve on this Committee?
 - b. If not, what faculty members should be consulted?

IV. TENURE PROCEDURES

A. General Procedures

1. Each faculty member eligible for tenure consideration shall be evaluated by his department head and the tenured members of his department according to established college-wide deadlines and consistent with the consultative procedures expressed in Section I above.
2. Responsibilities of all parties in the evaluation process include the following:
 - (a) Faculty members being considered for tenure shall submit a resume of experience and accomplishments, giving valid reasons why tenure should be accorded, to those involved in the evaluation process. Such a statement may include a summary of activities, professional meetings, additional education, committee work, community relations, administrative duties and similar matters which will be considered in the evaluation.
 - (b) Each tenured faculty member and the department head shall make an effort to observe the professional competence and performance of his non-tenured colleagues so that he may assist, constructively, the evaluation process.
3. The results of the consultative evaluation, stated with reasonable particularity in summary or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the Department Head to the Dean. Such statements shall include reliable evidence which will validate recommendations of the consulted group and the Department Head.
4. No faculty member shall be accorded tenure who is not acceptable to a majority of the tenured faculty of the department or organizational unit concerned except under the conditions expressed in Sections I-C and I-E above.
5. Normally, tenure should not be granted in the case of a candidate who does not hold the appropriate terminal degree in his field of specialty from an accredited institution. Exception to this rule should be made only where a candidate shows exceptional competence and performance in teaching or other outstanding service to the academic community.
6. All committees and administrators other than the President who review and make recommendations on tenure shall forward reasons (in writing) for their recommendation. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.

7. If the recommendation of non-tenure is made by the department head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If the recommendation of non-tenure is made by the dean, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for non-tenure shall take place prior to review of the case by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
8. Notification of non-tenure shall be in writing in conformity with dates and procedures established in Title 5, California Administrative Code. Although the President or his designee may not routinely give written reasons for non-tenure, a faculty member may request and shall receive from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his non-tenure.

B. Special Provisions

Individual departments (or schools not having departments) should consider the following questions and incorporate the decisions in their written procedures:

1. What other individuals should be consulted in the evaluation process?
 - (a) Non-tenured colleagues?
 - (b) One or more students on an advanced level?
 - (c) Faculty members in other disciplines?
2. Should a separate tenure committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations? If so:
 - (a) Should it receive and consider written recommendations from the individuals determined in B-1?
 - (b) Should it report its recommendations back to the individuals determined in B-1?
 - (c) How should they be appointed?
3. What additional functions should the tenure committee or consulted group have?
 - (a) Are there particular evaluation methods that should be used?
 - (b) How shall their recommendations be presented?

V. PROMOTION PROCEDURES

A. General Provisions

1. Evaluation and associated consultation for promotion shall be carried out during the academic year prior to the first date of eligibility for promotion and in each subsequent year if not promoted.
2. The basic evaluation, for promotion, of the professional competence and performance in terms of the educational needs of the Department and the College shall be made by the individual's tenured colleagues of higher rank and the Department Head in accordance with the provisions of Section I above.
3. Faculty members eligible for promotion shall submit a resume of experience and accomplishments which demonstrates evidence of promotability to those involved in the evaluation process.
4. Consultation should be carried out with specific reference to approved criteria and standards developed and written down by the department and appropriate to the level of promotion. These criteria should be specific as to the following: (1) for which level of promotion the doctorate or other recognized terminal degree is a normal prerequisite and what exceptions may be applied and, (2) whether promotion in rank may or may not occur prior to tenure and, if not, what exceptions may be applied.
5. The results of the consultative evaluation, stated with reasonable particularity in summary or as individually signed statements, shall be forwarded in writing through the Department Head to the Dean. Such statements shall include reliable evidence which will validate the recommendations of the consulted group and the Department Head.
6. The recommendations of the Department Head normally should be in conformity with the recommendations of the faculty unit or committee consulted. If this is not the case, full explanation of the reasons for a contrary recommendation should be conveyed to the faculty unit or committee consulted, as well as the individual involved.
7. All committees and administrators other than the President who review promotion shall be required to forward reasons (in writing) for their recommendations. A copy of such recommendations and reasons shall be sent to the faculty member and to his file.
8. If the recommendation of non-promotion is made by the department head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision. If the recommendation of non-promotion is made by the dean or division head, he shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision in the presence of the department head. These discussions of reasons for non-promotion shall take place prior to review by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.

9. Although the President or his designee may not routinely give written reasons for non-promotion, the faculty member may request and shall receive, from the President or his designee, oral or written reasons for his non-promotion.

B. Special Provisions

Individual departments (or schools not having departments) should consider the following questions and incorporate the decisions in their written procedures:

1. What other individuals should be consulted in the promotional process?
 - a. Non-tenured colleagues?
 - b. One or more students on an advanced level?
 - c. Faculty members in other disciplines?
2. Should a separate promotion committee be charged with responsibility for recommendations? If so ...
 - a. Should it receive and consider written recommendations from the individuals determined in B-1?
 - b. Should it report its recommendations back to the individuals determined in B-1?
 - c. How should they be appointed?
3. What additional functions should the promotion committee or consulted group have?
 - a. Are there particular evaluation methods that should be used?
 - b. How shall their recommendations be presented?